

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—It is a Motion to the effect that the hon'ble Minister Sri K. Puttaswamy had made a disclosure of information on the occasion of commissioning of the Filter Plant at Hosahalli near Krishnarajasagara on 15th September 1968 that a Bill seeking to convert the Mysore Municipality into a Corporation will be introduced, thereby he has disclosed policy matters. I think it is a breach of parliamentary convention, and the parliamentary convention requires that when the Assembly is in Session, policy matters should not be disclosed outside, because it amounts to breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps the hon'ble Member was inattentive when I informed Sri Shettar about it. Sri Shettar has given a Notice and it is before me. I said that I would consider it and give my Ruling after the recess. I know hon'ble Member Sri Kalmankar is a very senior lawyer. We are bound by rules here. Hon'ble member should make it a point not to rise without Chair's permission.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Sir, I have given a Notice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has not reached me yet.

RULING OF THE SPEAKER *re*: NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION BY SRI T. R. SHAMANNA AND OTHERS.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Four hon'ble Members Sriyuths T. R. Shamanna, M. S. Krishnan, Vatal Nagaraj and P. Thimmaiah have given a Notice of an Adjournment Motion under Rule 50, wherein for reasons 1 to 11 they want the elections to Bangalore City Corporation to be held early and a discussion should be permitted in the House. I am bound by the Rules and the hon'ble Members, of course, have got to be satisfied that the Ruling is based on the Rules adopted by this House. Under Rule 50, if a matter is to be taken up for discussion, it must be of urgent public importance. The restrictions on the right to make a Motion of this nature are contained in Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure. Sub-rule (i) of Rule 52 state that not more than one such motion shall be made At the same sitting. This condition is satisfied and there is no difficulty. Sub-rule (ii) says that not more than one matter shall be discussed on the same motion.

The hon'ble members who have moved the Motion to raise the question of elections to the Bangalore City Corporation, have as many as eleven grounds. Though they have tried to put all these 11 grounds in support of one Motion, in effect they come to nearly 11 Adjournment Motions. Eleven separate grounds have been mentioned. The scope of this Motion cannot be fulfilled in two hours or so if all these 11 matters are to be considered. So, I think, there is a bar on taking this Motion under sub-rule (ii) of Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure.

Sub-rule (iii) of Rule 52 states that a motion shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence. This is a matter which has taken

(MR. SPEAKER)

place about two years back—no doubt it is an important matter—but it cannot be agitated today. After the supersession of the Bangalore City Corporation about two years back, many Sessions of the House were held, sessions have been adjourned also, and this matter came up before the House in many forms, in the form of questions and answers, in the form of discussion on the Governor's Address and in the form of discussion on the Budget and so on. Hon'ble Members, who have given notice of this motion may please realise that it is not a new matter, neither it is an urgent matter and neither a matter which has occurred very recently. Therefore, it is not possible to give my consent to this Motion and I cannot allow this Adjournment Motion to be taken up. I very much regret that I withhold my consent.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—The only point to be considered in the Resolution is the holding of elections. The present position is hopelessly bad in the Corporation and the urgency to hold elections is there. We have satisfied the requirements. We respect the Chair's Ruling. At the same time, you must understand our view point also, viz., the holding of elections.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Ruling of the Chair is not subject to comments. The hon'ble member has to respect the Ruling whether it is right or wrong.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—We are neither commenting nor complaining about the Ruling. We want a direction from the Chair against the harassment that the people of Bangalore City are having.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Chair can give direction to the hon'ble Members under the Rules. But it cannot give directions to the people outside.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—We are not satisfied with the reply given by the Hon'ble Minister Sri Puttaswamy. The whole State knows that the Hon'ble Minister is too clever in giving the reply.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, the hon'ble Member is making all undeserved comments.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, it is impossible to measure the Hon'ble Minister. We know what he was. Under these circumstances it is very difficult to get any relief. The Hon'ble Chair may please realise our personal feelings.

MR. SPEAKER.—My personal feelings have no relevance. The Chair is bound by the Rules.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Sir, my friends have been pursuing the Government through the Chair because the Corporation is a democratic institution. Let them not bury democracy deep. They have requested the Government, through the Chair Sir, to see that the elections are held early. I feel absolutely there are no impediments.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister said that the matter is under consideration. Hon'ble members may wait and see what they would consider.

SRI T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister was the President of the Mysore Municipality and he knows what democracy is. Till our grievances are redressed, we will wear the black badge throughout the present Session.

2-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ರಾಮಣ್ಣ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನದೊಂದು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರು ಇದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮೇಲೆ ಆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಪುನಃ ಪುನಃ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆಯೇ?

MR. SPEAKER.—I uphold the point of order of Sri Ramanna. When once the ruling is given it should be accepted without any comments.

MYSORE MINISTERS SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968

(Debate Contd.)

CLAUSES

MR. SPEAKER.—We have to consider clauses of this Bill.

†SRI M. NAGAPPA (Raichur).—The other day when I moved my amendments to the original Act they were considered out of order. To substantiate that the amendments are within the scope of the Bill I am submitting my arguments. While considering the scope of the Bill, we have to see the preamble, the title and the definitions of Bill. So far as the preamble is concerned, it has been mentioned there : 'a Bill further to amend the Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances Act, 1956'. It is not clear from this there is the expediency to further amend the Bill of 1956. Secondly most of the provisions of the Act have been amended—Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and all other sections have been amended. One section is inter-related to another Section. If one decision is taken regarding the definition of a Minister it is with regard to the old Act. There were two categories. Now it was sought to be increased to three categories. The definition has been amended accordingly. It has got relation with the old Act. I will submit one Ruling of West Bengal Legislature wherein this has been very diligently pointed out. It reads as follows :

“An amendment must be relevant to and within the scope of the question to which it is proposed. Now relevancy is of much wider connotation than scope and what is relevant may not be within the scope. Both these tests must be satisfied before an amendment is in order.